

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-13 are rejected. Claims 9, 11, and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. All claims have been cancelled herein and represented as new claims 18-34. Also, new claims 35-38 have been added.

For the convenience of Examiner Bui, Applicant provides the following table showing how the new claims correspond to the previous ones, and where support can be found in the specification.

New Claim Number	Support from Previous Claim or Specification	Comments
18	1, 14	Claim 14 allowed
19	1, 15	Claim 15 allowed
20	1, 4	Discussed in remarks
21	1, 5	“
22	1, 4, 5	“
23	1,2, 14	Claim 14 allowed
24	3	Depends from allowed claim
25	6	“
26	7	“
27	8	“
28	9	“
29	10	“
30	11	“
31	12	“
32	13	“
33	16	“
34	17	“
35	Page 2, paragraph 0005	“
36	Page 3, paragraph 0010	“
37	Page 6, paragraph 0015	“
38	Page 7, paragraph 0018	“

Regarding the Preliminary Amendments, Applicant states that the first Preliminary Amendment was filed on 21 December 2001 and the second Preliminary Amendment was filed on 8 August 2002. It appears that the dates noted in paragraph 1 of the Official Action are incorrect.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-13 have been rejected as anticipated by U.S. patent 3,570,525 to Borsum. Applicant requests consideration of the following remarks.

Examiner Bui will note that the rejected claims have been rewritten herein. Specifically, claim 1, which now has been rewritten into new claim 18 incorporating limitations from claim 14, which claim has been allowed. Claim 1 has also been rewritten into new claim 19 incorporating limitations from claim 15, which claim has also been allowed. Claim 1 has also been rewritten into new claim 23, along with limitations from claims 2 and 14. Accordingly, since claims 9, 11, and 14-17 are not subject to the present rejection, then the rejection will not apply to the new claims that incorporate the subject matter of these claims (namely claims 18, 19, 23, 28, 30, 33 and 34). Therefore, Applicant will respond to this rejection as it relates to the remaining pending claims.

Examiner Bui will note that new independent claims 20-22 each contain the limitation that the regulating sleeve is longitudinally adjustable. Applicant submits that Borsum does not teach or suggest that the hose is connected to the regulating sleeve and clamped between the regulating sleeve and regulating member, and further that the regulating sleeve is longitudinally adjustable.

In addition, Applicant submits that Borsum does not teach or show a ring nozzle as an air shield around the central outlet nozzle, as specified in independent claims 20-22. Moreover, Borsum does not teach or suggest a ring projection as providing contact protection, which projects beyond the tip of the outlet, as specified in independent claims 18-22.

Moreover, since the allowed claims have been rewritten in independent form, Borsum does not apply and need not be discussed further.

Regarding the Allowable Claims


Applicant thanks Examiner Bui for finding that claims 9, 11 and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons pointed out above, Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, Examiner Bui is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCIEN MASSON

By: 
Lawrence A. Maxham
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,483

THE MAXHAM FIRM

Symphony Towers
750 "B" Street, Suite 3100
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 233-9004
Facsimile: (619) 544-1246